

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

NANNETTE BASA, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRAND SHARED SERVICES, LLC, a
Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

No. 2:21-cv-00754

**AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
JURY DEMAND**

COMES NOW the Plaintiff, NANNETTE BASA, by and through her attorneys, and
alleges as follows:

I. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff resides in Snohomish County, Washington.
2. Defendant Brand Shared Services, LLC is a Delaware corporation doing business
in Washington. Defendant does business as “BrandSafway”.

II. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

3. All acts and omissions occurred in Snohomish County, Washington. Therefore,
the Western District of Washington at Seattle is the proper venue, pursuant to LCR 3(e)(1).

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
1331, in that this complaint contains civil actions arising under federal law (Section 1981 Civil

1 Rights claim). This Court also has supplemental subject matter jurisdiction over the related state
 2 law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3 **II. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 These factual allegations are not intended to be exhaustive in nature and are written solely
 5 to provide notice to the Defendants of the general nature of Plaintiff's claims.

6 5. Defendant employed Ms. Basa as a recruiter. Before 2018, Defendant classified
 7 Ms. Basa as an independent contractor. In 2018, Defendant hired Ms. Basa as a full-time
 8 employee. She worked remotely from her home in Snohomish County, Washington.

9 6. Ms. Basa reported to two different managers as an employee of Defendant: Rod
 10 Broschinsky and then (starting in October 2019) Karen Riapos. Ms. Riapos was the Director of
 11 Talent Acquisition. Neither manager indicated anything negative about Ms. Basa's performance.

12 7. In approximately February 2020, Defendant hired two other recruiters in February
 13 2020: Ryan Wilson and Nicole Norris. Both were approximately 35 years old and both were
 14 white. Defendant paid both of these younger white employees substantially more than Ms. Basa.
 15 Ms. Basa was a 49 year old Filipina.

16 8. In December 2020, Defendant terminated Ms. Basa in a layoff, claiming that it
 17 needed to lay off some staff for financial reasons. However, soon after discharging Ms. Basa,
 18 BrandSafway hired additional recruiters, including another younger white male.

19 9. Ms. Basa's age was a substantial factor in the decision to terminate her
 20 employment. Ms. Basa's race was another substantial factor in that decision. Alternatively, Ms.
 21 Basa's age and her race combined to serve as a substantial factor in that decision.

22 **III. AGE DISCRIMINATION UNDER THE** 23 **WASHINGTON LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION**

24 10. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

25 11. Plaintiff's age was a substantial factor in Defendant's decision to pay Plaintiff
 26 less than younger workers and to terminate her employment, in violation of RCW 49.60.180.

12. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has been damaged both emotionally and financially. Such damages include, but are not limited to, lost past and future wages and benefits, consequential damages, and damages as a result of emotional distress, in an amount to be proved at trial.

**IV. RACE DISCRIMINATION UNDER THE
WASHINGTON LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION**

13. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

14. Plaintiff's race was a substantial factor in Defendant's decision to pay Plaintiff less than younger workers and to terminate her employment, in violation of RCW 49.60.180.

15. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has been damaged both emotionally and financially. Such damages include, but are not limited to, lost past and future wages and benefits, consequential damages, and damages as a result of emotional distress, in an amount to be proved at trial.

16. Alternatively, Plaintiff's age and her race were together a substantial factor in the termination decision by Defendant.

V. RACE DISCRIMINATION UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1981

17. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs.

18. Plaintiff's race was a factor in Defendant's decision to terminate her employment, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

19. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has been damaged both emotionally and financially. Such damages include, but are not limited to, lost past and future wages and benefits, consequential damages, and damages as a result of emotional distress, in an amount to be proved at trial.

VI. RELIEF REQUESTED

A. Plaintiff requests this court to find in favor of Plaintiff and against the Defendant on Plaintiff's causes of action and claims, in amounts to be proven at trial, with interest accruing thereon.

B. Plaintiff seeks general and special damages in amounts to be proven at trial, including damages for emotional distress, back pay, and front pay.

C. Plaintiff seeks punitive damages for her claim arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

D. Plaintiff seeks reasonable attorney's fees and costs, including expert witness fees, whether statutory or equitable, to be assessed herein, as provided by RCW 49.60.030.

E. Injunctive relief as may be appropriate to make Plaintiff whole.

F. Plaintiff seeks such further and additional equitable and legal relief as the court deems just and equitable.

VII. JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

DATED: this 12th day of July, 2021:

LAW OFFICES OF ALEX J. HIGGINS

s/Alex J. Higgins

Alex J. Higgins, WSBA No. 20868

BEAN LAW GROUP

s/Cody Fenton-Robertson

Cody Fenton-Robertson, WSBA No. 47879

2200 6th Ave, Suite 500

Seattle, WA 98121

(206) 522-0618